



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,056	08/31/2000	John R. Hind	RSW9-2000-0069-USI	2975
7590 11/09/2004			EXAMINER	
IBM Corporation Intellectual Property Law			HILLERY, NATHAN	
P O Box 12195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Res Tri Park, NC 27709			2176	
			DATE MAILED: 11/09/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/652,056	HIND ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 04 October 2004 FAILS TO PITHEREFORE, further action by the applicant is required in all rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of American (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	d to avoid abandonment of this ner: (1) a timely filed amendme Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in	d
PERIOD FO	OR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the	e mailing date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPL 706.07(f).	expire later than SIX MONTHS from	he mailing date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(asee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by simely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. S	period of extension and the correspor date of the shortened statutory period the Office later than three months afte	ding amount of the fee. The appropriate ext for reply originally set in the final Office action	tension on; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	ered because:		
(a)  they raise new issues that would require	e further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see	Note below);	·	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	ation in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplifying	the
(d)  they present additional claims without c NOTE:	anceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s): See Continuation	Sheet.	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely filed amendm	nent
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requeapplication in condition for allowance because		en considered but does NOT place t	he
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		DLELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amene explanation of how the new or amended claim			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as fol	llows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>10-20,32-42 and 44</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>21-31</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	'		
• •	 ] approved or b)☐ disappro	ved by the Examiner.	

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).



Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 101 regarding claims 1 - 9 and 43 as necessitated by cancellation.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: although the Office agrees that the invention "can be" implemented by computer program intructions which "may" be provided to a processor (page 15, last paragraph of arguments), the Office maintains that the claimed invention of claims 21 - 31 is still nonstatutory because it does not have to involve any hardware and is thus sofware per se in light of the specification because they are means plus function claims.